*Hieracium venosum L., var. nudicaule (Michx.) Farwell. For discussion see Fernald in Rhodora, xlv. 323 (1943). The only Virginian material I have seen is from the slopes of Bull Run Mountains, Prince William County, *Allard*, no. 647 and 3321. The plant of the Tidewater region is typical *H. venosum*.

A further Note on the Date of Pursh's Flora[1].—In Rhodora **40:** 354 (1938) Professor Fernald accepts 1814 as the date of Pursh's *Flora* but nevertheless accords it priority over certain plates in the *Botanical Magazine* dated by the engraver "Nov. 1, 1813" and "Dec. 1, 1813", on the assumption that these dates refer to the engraving of the plates and do not mean that the plates so dated were issued with their accompanying text on November 1 and December 1 respectively. Such a statement indicates a misconception of the purpose of the dates on eighteenth and nineteenth century prints. The plates of the *Botanical Magazine* and similar publications were dated in order to comply with the British print copyright Acts of 1734, 1766 and 1777 which gave legal protection to the inventors, designers and engravers of prints for the term of fourteen (or, after 1766, twenty-eight) years "to commence from the Day of the first publishing thereof, which shall be truly engraved . . . on each Plate, and printed on every such Print or Prints" (cf. *Journ. of Bot.* **78:** 67; 1940). Since the dates on these prints were intended to be those of their first publishing, they had to be engraved upon the plates in advance of publication and it may be that circumstances unforeseen at the time of engraving occasionally delayed publication beyond the dates given. Yet, to judge from some contemporary reviews, the issue of the monthly parts of the *Botanical Magazine* was fairly regular and in the absence of evidence to the contrary the dates engraved on its plates, though possibly not always correct to the day, must be accepted as correct to the month. They can be checked by reference to the *General Indexes to . . . the first forty-two Volumes of the Botanical Magazine* (1817) which give the contents and month of issue of each part. The title-page of volume **39** is dated

[1] In Rhodora, xlv. 415 (1943) the Editors added a footnote which, owing to the long delay in hearing from the author of the article, was allowed to stand. It now appears that it and the item referred to were based on misconception. We apologize.—Eds.

"1814" but that is the date of the first part; the first part (no. 322) was issued in November 1813. Thus *Rudbeckia columnaris* Sims (*Bot. Mag.* **39:** t. 1601; Dec. 1813) antedates *R. columnaris* Pursh (Jan. 1814) and *Lophiola aurea* Ker-Gawl (*Bot. Mag.* **39:** t. 1596; Nov. 1813) antedates *Conostylis americana* Pursh (Jan. 1814).—W. T. Stearn.

LILIUM MICHIGANENSE, L. CANADENSE AND L. SUPERBUM

Edwin D. Hull

In an article in this Journal[1], in which a wild lily from the Lake Michigan dune country of northern Indiana, called by some botanists *L. michiganense*, was compared with typical *L. superbum*, mostly from the Atlantic Coastal Plain, I concluded that *L. michiganense* was not valid, being in reality *L. superbum*. To this article Dr. Wherry[2] took considerable exception, concluding that *L. michiganense* was nearer *L. canadense* than it was to *L. superbum*, and that all three should be considered distinct, "though not necessarily in species status". Constructive criticism is welcome, but, after further field and herbarium study, I can see no reason for separating *L. michiganense* from *L. superbum* and, furthermore, *L. superbum* and *L. canadense* are distinct species.

In the dune country of Indiana there are many areas of marsh, bordering which in some instances are low woods. The lilies are found in both habitats, mostly, however, in the open. Much of this country has been drained and turned to cultivation, but there are still hundreds of flowering specimens, and many more plants which have deteriorated to a degree where they no longer flower, although they persist in a vegetative state for many years. I think no botanist would doubt after seeing these lilies that all the plants were of the same species.

Leaf-Indument. I cannot see that this is a good diagnostic character, as it is obviously a matter of environment in the specimens I have studied. The spring and early summer of 1943

[1] *Lilium superbum and L. michiganense.* Rhodora **44:** 220. 1942.
[2] *Relationship of Lilium michiganense.* Rhodora **44:** 453. 1942.